

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Amendments

The specification and claims have been amended to correct the spelling of “insulation”, various other minor changes suggested by the examiner have been incorporated, and claims 2-3, 7, 17, and 19-20 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 16 have been amended to recite a knitted wire mesh (as supported at least at page 6, line 20) and that the mesh is crimped to provide a herringbone pattern (Fig. 4) and dams that block and direct gas flow (page 8, lines 12-17). No new matter is added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112[2]

Claims 3, 17, and 19 have been amended to recite that the structure limits gas flow around the monolith.

Claim 7 has been cancelled.

The paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 has been amended consistent with the disclosure of the percentages in original claims 10 and 11.

The paragraph bridging pages 1 and 3 has been amended to include the original disclosure of claim 12.

Page 6, line 22, discloses refractory fibers, and “ceramic” has been added thereto consistent with the disclosure in the original claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection for anticipation over Yamada is respectfully traversed. The independent claims have been amended to require that the mesh be knitted. Yamada discloses only a “mesh,” a material having holes. A knitted mesh, because each fiber/wire loop is attached to adjacent loops, is stronger and will

not deform as a simple woven mesh will deform (e.g., if one side is pulled on a standard mesh with square openings, the openings become parallelograms; a knitted mesh does not deform in that manner). Because the purpose is to support and cushion the catalytic converter monolith, and motions can occur in all three dimensions (x, y, and z), a knitted mesh provides a more robust support. A knitted mesh is also stronger when the can (housing) is assembled and installed on a vehicle, so that bending or twisting of the housing is resisted more by a knitted mesh than a woven mesh. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection over the combination of Yamada and Harding is respectfully traversed. While Harding shows a knitted mesh and crimping, none of the crimping is shown as herringbone, or multiple herringbone. Further, none of the crimping provides raised portions that act as dams blocking and directing the flow of gases. Since a purpose of the device is to provide cushioning, crimping is used. Another purpose being to prevent exhaust flow around the converter, a more tortuous path is desired, so one might crimp as in Harding. However, Harding does not disclose varying the crimp direction to provide an even more tortuous path, such as a herringbone or multiple herringbone configuration, and even further blocking fluid flow by providing dams via the crimping method.

The rejection over the combination of Santiago and Machida is respectfully traversed. Neither of these references discloses a knitted wire mesh. In fact, Machida specifically teaches away from using a wire mesh by the comparative examples comparing a wire mesh with an intumescent matt and the matt of that invention (col. "76", first full paragraph). Accordingly, these references are not properly combined.

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections, and further and favorable action, in the form of a Notice of Allowance, are believed to be in order, and such actions are earnestly solicited.